Office - Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
DEC 22 1982
ALEXANDER L. STEVAS,
CLERK

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1982

No. 82-952

STATE OF MARYLAND, ET AL.,

APPELLANTS,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL.

No. 82-953

TANDY CORPORATION,

APPELLANT,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL.

No. 82-992

NORTH AMERICAN TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION,

APPELLANT,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL.

No. 82-1001

STATE OF ILLINOIS,

APPELLANT,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL.

ON APPEALS FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MOTION TO EXPEDITE CONSIDERATION

The Solicitor General, on behalf of the United States, moves to expedite consideration of the jurisdictional statements in this case. In the event the Court notes probable jurisdiction, the Solicitor General further moves to expedite the argument in this case so that it may be submitted for decision within the present Term of the Court.

The jurisdictional statements filed in the above-captioned appeals seek direct review by this Court, pursuant to the Expediting Act, 15 U.S.C. 29(b), of a consent judgment in a civil antitrust case brought by the United States. The judgment, which requires substantial reorganization of the American Telephone & Telegraph Company (AT&T), will provide effective relief for the competitive harms alleged by the government, and it has been found by the district court to be in the public interest.

The United States is today filing a motion to affirm. For the reasons set forth in that motion, the United States agrees with appellants and the district court that immediate consideration of the appeals by this Court is of general public importance in the administration of justice and that this Court should, therefore, accept the direct appeals. Moreover, it is important that these appeals be resolved as early as possible, and delay in their resolution beyond the present Term of Court would have a broad and significant adverse impact on the telecommunications industry and on the public in general.

Accordingly, the United States suggests that the jurisdictional statements and motions to affirm be considered by the Court at its next scheduled conference. If the Court concludes to note probable jurisdiction and set the case for argument, we submit that the Court should require that briefs on the merits be submitted within the time provided by Rule 35 of the Rules of this Court, without extension, and should calendar the case for argument and submission within the present Term of Court.

Respectfully submitted.

REX E. LEE
Solicitor General

DECEMBER 1982